



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

112
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,806	09/25/2001	Reid Evan Wilson	1014-004US01	1202
28863	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER	
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P. A. 8425 SEASONS PARKWAY SUITE 105 ST. PAUL, MN 55125			FLEARY, CAROLYN FATIMAH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/963,806	WILSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carolyn F. Fleary	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 15-18, 30-36, 38, 52 and 64-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 10, 13, 14, 19, 31, 32, 37, 39-51, 53-63 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2152

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Acknowledgement is mad of applicant's amendment to the specification in papers filed April 4th 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 38,52,64-66 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claim 38 fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the reply filed 04/04/2005. In that paper (pg. 18 para. 5, pg. 19 para 3), applicant has stated "receiving output from a router in a format describing a type of output", and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because there is no output is being obtained from the claimed "routing device" , rather components comprising said routing device exchange output (e.g. router system provide output to a client interface).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 20,29, and 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 20,29, and 34 are not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 5 , line 1-15, the

Art Unit: 2152

computer readable medium (e.g. processor readable medium) is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., computer storage media) and intangible embodiments (e.g., modulated data signal, such as a carrier wave). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory. A computer readable medium having instructions thereon which when executed perform the steps of a useful method would normally be considered statutory unless the specification defines "computer readable medium" as including intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media or other media incapable of being touched or perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed. See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed.Cir. 1994). See also *Schrader*, 22 F.3d at 295, 30 USPQ2d at 1459.

Claims 32, 52, and 58, although the preamble recites an apparatus (e.g. routing device), the elements/features of the claimed apparatus are not necessarily implemented in hardware. The claim is a best directed toward and arrangement of software per se. As such, the claim is not tangibly embodies, and is therefore non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the

Art Unit: 2152

international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2 and 20-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mwikalo et al. (US 6,480,508).

In regards to claim 1 and 20, Mwikalo et al. discloses a method and processor-readable medium comprising instructions (e.g. router executing the following steps) for causing a programmable processor to comprising:

- receive output (e.g. DNS message-400) from a router(202) in a format describing a type of output (fig. 4-5, col. 6 ll. 26-42, e.g. request formatted as DNS query)
- query a server (110,112,120) selected as a function of the type of output (col. 6 ll. 17-25 e.g. requests of DNS query type are forwarded to DNS server); and
- provide a response from server to a user (col. 6 ll. 65 – col. 7 ll. 9 e.g. server responds to router [user 1] which in turn sends response to a local host [user 2])

In regards to claims 2 and 21, Mwikalo et al. discloses a method and processor readable medium of claim 1 and 20, wherein the output is a numeric address (fig. 6 col. 6 ll. 44-64, col. 7 ll. 25-42, e.g. source address, destination address, global DNS address, mac address).

3. Claims 1-4 and 20-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by White et al. (US 6,711,241).

In regards to claim 1 and 20, White et al. discloses a method and processor-readable medium comprising instructions (e.g. router system executing the following steps) for causing a programmable processor to:

- receive output(e.g. DNS request) from a router(85) in a format describing a type of output (fig. 6-#220, col. 11 ll. 5-6 e.g. request formatted as DNS request)

Art Unit: 2152

- query a server (DNS Server -202) selected as a function of the type of output (col. 6 II. 5-18 e.g. request type for DNS translation are forwarded to DNS server); and
- provide a response (e.g. IP address or Host Name) from server to a user (col. 6 II. 5-24, router (85), destination router(116)).

In regards to claims 2 and 21, White et al. discloses a method and processor readable medium of claim 1 and 20, wherein the output is a numeric address (IP address , customer input IP address request sent to router(85) which queries DNS for inverse request: IP address-host name, col. 10 II. 64-65, col. 11 II. 6-9,col. 11 II. 16-18).

In regards to claim 3 and 22 White et al. discloses a method and processor readable medium of claims 2 and 21 comprising:

- querying a name server (e.g. DNS server) selected as a function of the type of the output (col. 6 II. 5-18 e.g. request type for DNS translation are forwarded to DNS server)
- receiving from the name server a symbolic name (e.g. domain or host name) associated with the numeric address (e.g. inverse function taking IP address and retuning host name) (col. 11 II. 7-18)

In regards to claim 4 and 23, the rejection of claim 2 also applies here. White et al. disclose an owner database (e.g. DNS server/database which houses the host name to IP address relationship associated with a customer premise equipment-127, which is an owner of an IP address and host name), said owner database sends identification (e.g. host name) of an owner (127) associated with an numeric address (e.g. IP address col. 10 II. 28-35, col. 10 II. 61- col. 11 II. 8) received by a user (router-85, destination router-116).

4. Claims 11, 12, 15, 29,30,33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pabla (US 2002/0156875).

In regards to claim 11, 12, 15 and 29 Pabla discloses the method and processor readable medium comprising instructions for causing said method to:,

- receive a numeric address (e.g. messages which contain unique identifier of a peer) in a self-describing format [0013][0042][0044][0147].
- query a name server (DNS or Peer Name Server) to resolve the numeric address into a symbolic name (e.g. reverse lookup); and providing a symbolic name to a user (abs, [0008][0044][0049])
- wherein the numeric address identifies a network peer (e.g. [0044], e.g. unique identifier of a peer)

5. Claims 38, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abjanic (US 6,732,175).

In regards to claim 38,Abjanic discloses a routing device (145, e.g. this is a device that performs routing col. 4 ll. 66- col. 5 ll. 3) comprising:

- a client interface(316,320) to receive operation request from network client(132,120,110);
- and a router system module to process the operation request (312) and provide output to the client interface (316,320) in a format (e.g. configuration pattern) that describes the type of the output (e.g. application or business transaction type) (col. 8 ll. 53-67);

Art Unit: 2152

- wherein the client interface (316,320) is configured to query a server selected as function of the type of the output ((col. 8 ll. 53-col. 9 ll. 11) and provide a response from the server to the network router client (col. 10 ll. 66-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claim 5 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 6,711,241). as applied to claim 1 further in view of Hinckey et al. (US 2002/0122547)**

In regards to claims 5 and 24, White et al. discloses the method and processor readable medium of claim 2 and 20. White is silent on the method of claim 2 further comprising querying a router policy database selected as a function of the type of output; receiving from the router policy database an identification of one or more router polices associated with the numeric address; and providing the identification of the one or more router polices as the response to the user.

White et. al and Hinckey et al. are with the same environment of processing request services (e.g. voice) in a network. In the instance case white discloses querying (624) a router policy database(114) selected as a function of the type of output (e.g. call set up information, call attributes); receiving from the router policy database (114) and identification of one or more router polices (320) associated with the numeric address

Art Unit: 2152

(308e.g. called phone number, IP address [0009][0044]); and providing the identification of the one or more router polices as a response to the user ([0010][0036][0054][0060][0078])

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify White et al. by having that which is taught by Hinchey et al. above in order to route output to an appropriate destination[0010][0036][0054][0060][0078].

8. Claims 6,16 ,25 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 6,711,241) in view of Giroti et al. (US 2003/0018700).

In regards to claim 6 and 25 White discloses claim 1 and 20, however White et al. fail to disclose wherein the output is in an XML-tagged output.

Giroti et al. and White et al. are analogous art and both disclose delivering services (e.g. voice, data etc.) to users over a network. In the instance case, Giroti et al. discloses a router (30) output (e.g. messages and XML data packets) between IP, Wireless, and PSTN networks[0026].

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify White et al. by having receiving an XML-tagged output from a router, as taught by Giroti et al. in order to delivery both voice and data to a user simultaneously and synchronously and enable users to interact with computer applications in a generally richer manner, enhancing service effectiveness and user satisfaction ([0006][0008][0021][0027][0029]).

In regards to claim 16 and 34 White et al. discloses a method and processor readable medium comprising instructions to perform the following steps comprising said method:

Art Unit: 2152

- receiving a command (e.g. requesting communication col. 10 ll. 61-65) in a user interface module (206)
- invoking a system module (204)to process the command
- receiving (202) an IP address from the system module (204)
- querying a domain name server (202) to resolve the IP address to a symbolic name (reverse name lookup/DNS)
- providing the symbolic name(e.g. domain or host name) to a user (85,116)

White et al. silent on wherein said IP address is an XML tagged IP address

Giroti et al. and White et al. are analogous art and both disclose delivering services (e.g. voice, data etc.) to users over a network. In the instance case, Giroti et al. discloses a system module (30) output (e.g. messages and XML data packets) between IP, Wireless, and PSTN networks[0026].

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify White et al. by having that which is taught by Giroti et al. above for the same reasons as indicated under the rejection of claim 6 (White et al. in view of Giroti et al. above)

9. Claims 17,18,35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 6,711,241) in view of Giroti et al. (US 20030018700) as applied to claim 16 and 34 above further in view of Tan et al. (US 6,314,469).

In regards to claim 17, 18, 35, and 36 , White et al. in view of Giroti et al. are silent on

- rendering the IP address in a text format different from an XML-tagged format of the IP address before querying the domain name server

Art Unit: 2152

- wherein the text format is selected from the group consisting of an ASCII format, a UTF-8 format, and a Unicode format.

Tan et al. discloses an network component (16) for rendering output in a text format different from the format describing the type of output which is selected from the said group (e.g. Unicode, ASCII) before querying the server (e.g. name server-18).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify White et al. in view of Giroti et al. by having that which is taught by Tan et al. above in order to convert text into a format that a name server can use thus enabling users to user to send non-Unicode and non ASCII encoded requests (abs, col. 2 ll. 55-59c. 9 ll. 53-62).

10. Claims 7 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US 6,711,241) as applied to claim 1 further in view of Hind et al. (US 2002/0161801).

In regards to claim 7 and 26, White et al. discloses claim 1 and 20, however White et al. fail to further disclose rendering the output in a text format different from the format describing a type of the output before querying the server

Hind et al. discloses rendering the output in a text format different from the format describing a type of the output (e.g. xml) before querying the server(325) [0046]

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify White et al. by having rendering the output in a text format different from the format describing a type of the output before querying the server, as taught by Hind et al. for effectively offloading XML parsing overhead from a server ([0007][0009][0020][0046])

Art Unit: 2152

11. Claims 6, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mwikalo et al. (US 6,480,508) in view of Monday (US 6,480,860).

In regards to claim 6 and 25, Mwikalo et al. discloses claim 1 and 20, however Mwikalo et al. fail to disclose wherein the output is in an XML-tagged output

Monday disclose a router (125) where a component (e.g. xml translator) receives xml tagged output (xml-tagged request) (col. 7 ll. 41-67, col. 8 ll. 33-37)

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mwikalo et al. by receiving output in an XML-tagged format, as taught by Monday in order to allow requests to be made via user-friendly interfaces that are easy to use rather than requiring cryptic commands be used by a user to obtain information from a server (col. 4 ll. 60-col. 5 ll. 2)

12. Claims 7, 8, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mwikalo et al. (US 6,480,508) in view of Tan et al. (US 6,314,469).

In regards to claim 7,8, 26 and 27, Mwikalo et al. discloses the method of claim 1 and processor readable medium of claim 20 which comprises a plurality of network components (See Mwikalo 120,122,110,112) for processing text output from a router(102)

Mwikalo et al. are silent on rendering the output in a text format different from the format describing a type of the output before querying the server; wherein the text format is selected from the group consisting of ASCII format, a UTF format and a Unicode.

Tan et al. discloses an network component (16) for rendering output in a text format different from the format describing the type of output which is selected from the said group (e.g. Unicode, ASCII) before querying the server (e.g. name server-18).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mwikalo et al. by having that which is taught by Tan et al. above in order to convert

Art Unit: 2152

text into a format that a name server can use thus enabling users to user to send non-Unicode and non-ASCII encoded requests (abs, col. 2 ll. 55-59c. 9 ll. 53-62).

13. Claims 9 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mwikalo et al. (US 6,480,508) in view of Pabla (US 2002/0156875).

Mwikalo et al. discloses the methods of claim 1 and programmable readable medium of claim 20 for executing said methods. Mwikalo discloses a router (102) which outputs numeric address to servers (110,112,120).

Pabla discloses a peer (e.g. the router[102] of Mwikalo) which initiates a discovery on a Peer Name Server (e.g. a component of Mwikalo et al network, See Pabla [0042]). The Peer Name server in response provides a list of peer names (e.g. a reverse lookup capability disclosed by Pablo [0049], hence the output from said peer to said peer name server is a list of numeric address of network peers.) [0042][0049][0059][0060][0089][0100][0101]

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mwikalo et al. by having output comprising a listing of network peers identified by numeric address, as taught by Pablo in order to reduce the load on server systems by allowing peers to bypass the server for information, file exchange and other resource sharing, allowing the servers to perform services which require the specialized hardware and/or software of a "dedicated" server system [060][0010].

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments see pg. 4 "objection to disclosure", filed April 4, 2005 with respect to the Disclosure as amended have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of the disclosure has been withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2152

15. Applicant's arguments see pg. 14 "objection to Drawings, filed April 4, 2005, with respect to Drawings have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of drawings has been withdrawn.

16. Applicant's arguments see pg. 15-16 under "Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, with respect to Claims 20,29,34,38,52,58, and 64-66 filed April 4th, 2005 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph of Claims 20,29,34,38,52,58, and 64-66 has been withdrawn.

17. Applicant's arguments in regards to claims rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 20,29, and 34 are not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 5 , line 1-15, the computer readable medium (e.g. processor readable medium) is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., computer storage media) and intangible embodiments (e.g., modulated data signal, such as a carrier wave). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory. A computer readable medium having instructions thereon which when executed perform the steps of a useful method would normally be considered statutory unless the specification defines "computer readable medium" as including intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media or other media incapable of being touched or perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed. See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed.Cir. 1994). See also *Schrader*, 22 F.3d at 295, 30 USPQ2d at 1459.

Art Unit: 2152

Claims 32, 52, and 58, although the preamble recites an apparatus (e.g. routing device), the elements/features of the claimed apparatus are not necessarily implemented in hardware. The claim is best directed toward and arrangement of software per se. As such, the claim is not tangibly embodies, and is therefore non-statutory.

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

19. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., router) are not recited in the rejected claim(s) (i.e. Claim 38,52,64-66). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 52-63,65-66 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 52-63,65-66 has been withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

21. Claim 10,13,14,19,31,32,37,39-51,53-63 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

22. Claim 52,65-66 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Art Unit: 2152

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Citation of prior art from prior office action incorporated herein. Refer to Notice of References Cited: Form PTO-892 for additional references cited as being pertinent to applicants disclose

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn F. Fleary whose telephone number is (571) 572-7218. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Carolyn F Fleary
Examiner
Art Unit 2152

CFF



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100